

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Examiner's Office Action mailed 8/26/2004, claims 1-14 were rejected. A reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-14 remain in the application for consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 as initially filed stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bloomfield et al.*, (U.S. 5,412,776). Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Krause*, (U.S. 6,160,554). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Krause*, (U.S. 6,160,554), further in view of *Staab*, (U.S. 5,499,334). Claims 5, 6, 9, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Kitami*, (U.S. 5,668,962). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Kitami*, (U.S. 5,668,962), further in view of *Krause*, (U.S. 6,160,554). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Kitami*, (U.S. 5,668,962), further in view of *Staab*, (U.S. 5,499,334).

Applicants respectfully submit that *Bloomfield*, alone and in combination with the other cited references, does not disclose or render obvious applicants' invention as claimed in the amended claims 1-14. In rejecting claims 1-14, the Examiner cited *Bloomfield* as disclosing a preview for one of the plurality of open application windows, interpreting the displaying of an "associated object name as displaying a preview for an application window." Page 3. *Bloomfield* defines "object" as for example "documents or user data files" Col. 8 lines 1-2. Thus an "object name" according to *Bloomfield* is that text which represents the name, which the computer uses

to identify the content of an application. This is representative of the prior art solution that was fully disclosed and distinguished from the present invention by the applicants. For example, in paragraph 10, while, referring to Figure 4, applicants disclose that in the prior art solution, “a brief textual description is provided”. This example had the object name “RESUME”. Furthermore, applicants’ invention distinguishes “preview” as an item that is separate from and additional to “text” (possibly including object name) or “icon,” as described in paragraph 43. This is depicted in Figure 3B. Applicants’ definition of “preview,” as an element, which is additional to a mere object name, precludes this from being counted as a species of “preview”. “A preview is defined as a graphical display of a window that shows the contents of the window.” Paragraph 39. The information in a preview is further exemplified saying: “Generally, a preview is presented as a thumbnail. A thumbnail is a miniature version of an image or electronic version of a page that allows a quick view of the image or page.” Paragraph 39.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended to clarify this distinction. The claims make clear that the preview is an extracted graphical preview of the window content. Because *Bloomfield* teaches a simple textual “object name” but not a “preview” as claimed, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims of the present application are allowable, as all pending claims require an extracted graphical preview, and this element is not supplied by *Bloomfield* as required.

With regard to claims 1, 7, and 8, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 8 as under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bloomfield et al.*, (U.S. 5,412,776). As explained above, while *Bloomfield* discloses the display of an object name, he does not disclose the display of a preview. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 should be allowed.

With regards to claim 2, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Krause*, (U.S. 6,160,554). This combination relies upon *Bloomfield* to supply the preview element. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 should be allowed also for this reason alone. Applicants further respectfully request that *Krause* be withdrawn because it teaches away from a combination with *Bloomfield*. For the two references to be properly combined, a plurality of application windows must be running. But *Krause* disparages this element as disadvantageous in at least three locations: (1) "Another option available to the computer operator is to launch an application capable of interpreting the format of the file he wishes to use or view. This solution consumes both time and resources. The operator has to wait for the application to load and run before he can view the file." Column 1 lines 33-37. (2) "In a preferred embodiment, the invention provides the ability to view an abbreviated description of a file's content or intended use without the operator having to explicitly open it using an application designed to interpret the file's contents, or to execute it." Column 1, lines 52-56. (3) "Using the teachings of the present patent document, the operator does not have to... read the contents of the file by launching an application program for that purpose." Column 1 line 66 to Column 2, line 3. Thus, *Krause* does not contemplate a plurality of open applications, and in fact, teaches away from such an environment.

With regards to claims 3 and 4, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bloomfield*, (U.S. 5,412,776), in view of *Krause*, (U.S. 6,160,554), further in view of *Staab*, (U.S. 5,499,334). This combination relies upon *Bloomfield* to supply the preview element. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 4 should be allowed also for this reason alone. In rejecting claims 3 and 4, the Examiner states that *Staab* teaches a “preview for each of the plurality of open application windows.” Applicants submit that the figure relied upon presents a display of “a virtual desktop with multiple desktop configurations.” Column 4 lines 49-50. A configuration differs from open application windows, because they provide “rectangular representations of a persistently saved window configuration” Column 4, lines 20-22, rather than “an actual window of an active program” Column 4, lines 15-16.

With regards to claims 5, 6, 9, and 12-14, in light of the discussion regarding claim 1 above, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable because they depend upon *Bloomfield* to supply the element of a preview, which, as explained above, is not provided, as defined and claimed in the applicants’ amended claims.

With regards to claims 10 and 11, in the light of the discussion regarding claim 1 above applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for the same reasons.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the pending rejections and the allowance of claims 1-14. The Examiner is invited

Appl. No. 10/027,854  
Amdt. Dated Nov. 24, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of Aug. 26, 2004

to telephone the undersigned if he believes that an interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott B. Strohm". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "S" and a cursive "B".

Scott B. Strohm  
Reg. No. 42,172

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
Phone: 816/474-6550  
Fax: 816-421-5547